

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,037	HAVENS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:

Status of Application: amended

(1) Tiffany A Fetzner.

(3) _____.

(2) Attorney jeffery J. Chapp Reg. No. 50,579.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 July 2004

Time: 1pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

The 112 confusion resulting from ambiguity as to what limitations are simulated and what limitations are not simulated.

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 9, 19 and dependent claims 4 and 11 which are dependent upon the simulated motions of the independent claims.

Prior art documents discussed:

None.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative, to request further clarification of the simulated/non-simulated issue that was still not resolved by applicant's July 6th 2004 response to the April 6th 2004 office action. In the course of the discussion the fact that it was the motions of the one or more MRI system components that was simulated was clarified. In an effort to further prosecution the examiner requested permission to perform an examiner's amendment to independent claims 1, 9, 19, and dependent claims 4, 11 to insert the word "simulated" in front of the word "motions" in all instances in the claim where a "motion signal" was being generated, to reflect the proper antecedent basis and clearly identify those portions of the claims with "simulated motion" limitations. Applicant also argues that the limitations of claims 1, 9, and 19 are performed in response to simulated component motions, therefore providing the word "simulated" before the word motions, when the motion of the MRI components is referred to in the claims, is supported by applicant's July 6th 2004 response. [See page 5 paragraph 2 the second to last sentence. The applicant agreed to let the examiner amend claim 4 and claim 11 the same way for consistency. The examiner also requested permission to fix a grammatical error in the last limitation of claim 19 by substituting "wherein" for "comprising" and replacing ", to be in" with "is adjusted to be within". The attorney gave permission for the examiner's amendment, to place the application in condition for allowance, authorized the charging of any necessary fees, and thanked the examiner for her help in furthering the prosecution of the instant application..